

DEC-09-2005 FRI 04:49 PM

FAX NO. RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

P. 01

DEC 09 2005

## COCHRAN FREUND & YOUNG LLC

An Intellectual Property Law Firm

2026 Caribou Drive  
Suite 201  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80525  
USA  
Telephone: (970) 492-1100  
Facsimile: (970) 492-1101

4450 Arapahoe Avenue  
Suite 100  
Boulder, Colorado 80303  
USA  
Telephone: (303) 448-8889

Denver Metro: (303) 288-4596

INTERNET: [www.patentlegal.com](http://www.patentlegal.com)

**Fax Transmission** | Date: December 9, 2005

To: Commissioner of Patents

From: Kathy Manke

Fax No.: 571-273-8300

Our Ref.: ESSE.01USU1

Application Serial No.: 09/741,665

Fax No.: (970) 492-1101

Examiner: Robert E. Rhode, Jr.

Phone No.: (970) 492-1100

Art Unit: 3625

Total Pages: 3 (Inc. cover sheet)

Customer No. 27479

Return Fax To:

Atty. Docket No. ESSE.01USU1

This transmission contains information that is confidential and/or legally privileged. It is intended for use only by the person to whom it is directed. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the return of the original documents to us.

If you did NOT receive all of the pages, please call us in the U.S.A. at (970) 492-1100 or fax us at (970) 492-1101.

C:\Fax Cover Sheets\PTO\_Fax Cover Sheet.doc

DEC 09 2005

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): William B. Douglas

Examiner: Robert E. Rhode, Jr.

Application No.: 09/741,665

Group Art Unit: 3625

Filing Date: December 18, 2000

Atty. Docket #: ESSE.01USU1

Title: BLIND-SUPPLY OPEN COMMERCE BUSINESS SYSTEM

---

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Sir:

Applicant's Attorney, William W. Cochran, conducted an interview with Examiner Rob Rhode on December 7, 2005. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time for this interview. In that interview, the last Office Action was discussed as well as Applicant's Response to the last Office Action.

As discussed in the interview, Fair Market discloses an online auction. Applicant's claimed invention is not an auction. Doyle is an in-house computerized ordering system for ordering office supplies. Applicant's claimed invention is not an in-house ordering system. Applicant's claims are directed to an on-line system for anonymously selling goods at a set price.

Fair Market and Doyle disclose two different types of systems that use two different principles of operation, i.e., one is an auction and the other is an in-house computerized ordering system. Not only is there no motivation shown to combine these references, but the modifications required to combine these references and reconstruct Applicant's invention would require a change in the basic operating principles of the references and render these references inoperable for their stated purposes. Certainly, the principles of operation of these systems of Fair Market and Doyle are different. Under the system of Fair Market, the highest bid price wins at the end of the day. Under the

ESSE.01USU1

system of Doyle, the prices are made available to the buyer, but there is no reason to keep the identity of the distributor secret. Picking and choosing the various features from the prior art to reconstruct Applicant's invention is clearly improper, especially when the reconstruction of Applicant's invention would require a change in the basic operating principles of the references. For example, picking the anonymity feature of the Fair Market system for use in the Doyle system would constitute a major change in the operation of the Doyle system. Conversely, Fair Market does not disclose a system in which a set price is provided to the buyer. Such a change would render the Fair Market system to no longer be an auction. Hence, the modifications required to combine these references would render these references inoperable for their stated purposes since the modifications would require changes in the basic principles of operation of the references. Hence, the combination of Fair Market and Doyle is improper.

Further, Applicant's claims require marking up of the price specified by the distributor. In other words, the price is marked up by a specific amount which is paid by the buyer. Fair Market discloses a system that teaches just the opposite. Under the Fair Market system, the seller pays a service fee. Hence, Fair Market fails to disclose a markup system in which the price specified, is marked up so that the buyer pays the fee rather than the seller.

Because of these clear differences and the reasons stated in the last response, this application clearly distinguishes from the prior art. Applicant therefore requests that this application be passed to issue.

Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day December 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

COCHRAN FREUND & YOUNG LLC

By: 

William W. Cochran  
Registration No. 26,652  
2026 Caribou Drive, Suite 201  
Fort Collins, CO 80525  
Phone: (970) 492-1100  
Fax: (970) 492-1101  
Customer No.: 27479